DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 202 803 SP 017 713

AUTHOR	Hughes, P. W.; And Others
TITLE	Curriculum Evaluation in the 1980's: A Review of Current School Level Evaluation Initiatives. Discussion Paper No. 2. Teachers As Evaluators Project.
SPONS AGENCY	Curriculum Development Centre, Canberra (Australia).
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-642-96228-6
PUB DATE	Oct 80
NOTE	20p.; For related documents, see SP 017 714-715. Prepared through the Teachers as Evaluators Project. Funded in part by the Educational Research and Development Committee.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Foreign Countries; Information Needs; School District Autonomy; School Policy; *Skill Development; *Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS	*Australia

ABSTRACT

There is an increasing awareness of the need for school-level curriculum evaluation in Australia, due to improved teaching and learning factors and to the wider role and responsibilities of schools in educational policy making. Although the school-level evaluation policies of the eight Australian states have similar goals, there are marked differences in the implementation of these policies. If teacher-initiated school-level curriculum evaluation is to succeed, the internal nature of the exercise must be emphasized to overcome teachers' perceptions of evaluation as threatening or time consuming. Teachers need resources to support them in planning evaluation workshops and are interested in the methods and results of evaluation activities carried out by others. They may need an information network, advisers, and a structured outline of the steps involved in starting curriculum evaluations. Future developments will depend on the ability of teachers to realize their potential as curriculum evaluators. (PG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED202803

TEACHERS AS EVALUATORS PROJECT

DISCUSSION PAPER NO. 2.

Curriculum Evaluation in the 1980's : A Review of Current School Level Evaluation Initiatives

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N. A. Russell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT CENTRE

Canberra Australia

Prepared by: P.W. Hughes
N.A. Russell
D. McConachy

October, 1980

A project jointly funded by C.D.C. & E.R.D.C.

SP 017 713

Published in October, 1980 by
The Curriculum Development Centre, Canberra, Australia
P.O. Box 52, Dickson, A.C.T. 2602

Copyright Curriculum Development Centre, 1980

ISBN 0 642 96228 6

Printed in Australia by Canberra College of Advanced Education
P.O. Box 1, Belconnen A.C.T. 2616

CATALOGUING IN PUBLICATION
National Library of Australia

Hughes, Phillip William, 1926 -
Curriculum evaluation in the 1980's

(Discussion paper; no.2)
Bibliography
ISBN 0 642 96228 6

1. Curriculum evaluation. 2. Teacher participation in curriculum planning. I. Russell, N.A., joint author. III. Teachers as Evaluators Project. (Series: Teachers as Evaluators Project. Discussion paper; no. 2)

375'.006

FOREWORD

The Teachers as Evaluators Project is jointly funded by the Curriculum Development Centre (C.D.C.) and the Educational Research and Development Committee (E.R.D.C.). Since its inception in 1977 the Project has worked on a collaborative, co-operative basis with State and Territorial Education Departments. It has also established exclusive links with Catholic and Independant school systems, the Schools Commission and tertiary institutions.

The Project is research and development oriented and this dual emphasis is reflected in the Paper, Curriculum Evaluation in the 1980's: A Review of the current school level evaluation initiatives.

The paper explores recent developments in curriculum evaluation in Australia and attempts to highlight similarities and differences, to facilitate the sharing of ideas and resources. It is hoped that it will stimulate discussion and provide practical assistance for people working in the area of school-level curriculum evaluation.

This is the second publication in the "Discussion Paper" series. The Project has also produced bibliographies, workshop materials, guidelines, newsletters, and audiovisual materials which are available from the Curriculum Development Centre.

Malcolm Skilbeck
Director
Curriculum Development
Centre

Sydney Dunn
Chairman
Educational Research
Development
Committee

Phillip Hughes
Director
Teachers as Evaluators
Project

A RATIONALE FOR SCHOOL-LEVEL CURRICULUM EVALUATION

The notion of school-level curriculum evaluation is not a new one. People constantly evaluate in their day to day activities and interactions. Most experienced teachers can tell intuitively if a lesson is successful, which children are having difficulty grasping the concepts, and where the program should be revised to meet these day to day teaching and learning issues. Until recently, there was little call for teachers to do more than informally gauge the success of their programs and assess their students because the curricula in secondary schools were prescribed by centralised bodies in each of the states. Details of these curricula were set out in the course outlines or syllabuses for the various subject as prescribed, and control of these syllabuses was exercised in a series of external examinations, and often reinforced by State Education Department School Inspectors.[1]

In the past decade however, there has been considerable change in Australian education, largely attributable to changes in society and a call to make schools more effective. There has been a 'trend' towards the democratisation of schools, manifested by a move towards increased teacher responsibility, school based curriculum development and individual school autonomy.[2] The roles of the external examination and the school inspector have been increasingly questioned and in some states and territories totally abandoned.

In this context, two factors can be identified to account for the rising awareness of the need for school-level curriculum evaluation:

1. improved teaching and learning
2. the wider role of the school.

These are not mutually exclusive; both are linked to the concept of school-based curriculum development and the ensuing trend towards devolution of responsibility to the school level.

Improved Teaching and Learning

Although in reality there is some differentiation between what is possible in schools, and what might or should be, theoretically the benefits of school-based curriculum are great.[3] Successful school-based curriculum development generates responsiveness to individual differences and a sense of staff involvement and commitment towards the school's policies and programs, encourages team work and can stimulate regular review and critical self-evaluation. Evaluation is generally seen as an intrinsic part of the school-based curriculum development process because review, reorganisation and decision-making are at the core of the curriculum development process and all three require information. Systematic evaluation ensures that this information is based on reason, rather than unguided intuition, emotion or external pressure.[4]

Thus, it appears that if teachers are to be given the freedom to develop or select their own curricula they must also take the responsibility for evaluating these to ensure that the needs of their students are being met in the best possible way. To be consistent, evaluation for curriculum improvement must be the responsibility of the teachers making curriculum decisions.

The wider role of the school.

Coupled with the notion of evaluation for curriculum improvement is an acknowledgement of the school's wider role. Ten years ago curricula could be publicly scrutinized and verified by means of the written syllabus, external examination results and visits by Departmental Inspectors. Control was seen to be firmly ensconced in the hands of a central authority. Now however, no-one appears to be in total control because much of this information rests in the hands of individual schools or regions. Evaluation is seen by politicians, employers and parents as one means of getting schools to publicly declare what they are doing.[5]

Obviously this is a simplistic explanation of an extremely complex development and the devolution of responsibility for curriculum development, and interpretations of the terms 'school-based curriculum development' and 'school-level curriculum evaluation' vary greatly among states and systems. Despite these variations, there is a general acknowledgement of the value of school-level evaluation and a number of initiatives are being implemented throughout Australia to encourage the process.

There is a danger however, that attempts to develop evaluation practice without a research base will lead to a multitude of activities being undertaken without any real attempt being made to examine the effects, determine the roles of the various participants and make explicit the underlying purposes and assumptions of the procedures.[6]

Already this may be happening. While there is a clear rationale for school-level evaluation, it is based on the premise that school-based curriculum development and decision-making do occur in Australian schools, and that schools have been given increased autonomy in the management of their affairs. Deschamp and McGaw claim that the state systems have not devolved responsibility for curriculum evaluation to the same extent as they have permitted responsibility for curriculum development, and that there appears to be a common agreement at the system-level that schools must be monitored for accountability purposes.[7] Consequently the school cannot be said to be totally responsible for its curriculum, which ultimately must affect curriculum development.

This restriction of a school's autonomy gives rise to a number of important questions for schools and systems to resolve. These include the following[8]:

1. What is the most effective role the system or central authority can play in curriculum evaluation to effect improvement in teaching and learning in schools?

2. What happens when different groups, for example, teachers, system personnel, politicians, place different emphases on the rationale for evaluation?

3. What is the place and value of school-level evaluation when the curriculum is tied to inspection systems and external examinations or testing programs?

4. What type of school-level evaluation can occur without school-based curriculum development?

5. What types of evaluation activities can teachers realistically be expected to undertake in the day to day running of the school?

6. What happens if teachers do not take up the call to evaluate, often because of inexperience and lack of understanding?

Obviously groups or individuals will have some answers, but until these are widely addressed by teachers, consultants and system personnel, further developments in the area of school-level evaluation will be hampered.

THE NATURE OF SCHOOL-LEVEL EVALUATION IN AUSTRALIA

It is extremely difficult to specify clearly the nature of school-level evaluation in Australia because policy statements and their implementation differs widely between states and systems and there is a frequent mismatch between stated policy and practice at the school level.

A brief review of the states' evaluation policies reveals that they are in apparent agreement about the nature of school-level evaluation:

> "It is suggested that systematic school evaluation is a co-operative effort and that it is most successful when all concerned with school development move together through each of these several steps required to complete the task; and that it will be most effective if a plan has been co-operatively developed and accepted as a basis for growth."[9]
>
> (Queensland)

> "The emphasis should be on self-appraisal by those who are in the school but with the school effort being supported by a facilitator and a visiting panel which will be so constituted as to provide all involved with a wider perspective, and greater depth of resources. Developmental school appraisal is hence seen primarily as a co-operative exercise, initiated by teachers for their professional development."[10]
>
> (Northern Territory)

"The major aim of School Review is school improvement ... It is desirable that there should be a regular evaluation of the operation of each school, both in the context of its own stated philosophy and objectives, and in relation to the total education system."[11]

(Victoria)

"In keeping with the move towards increasing school-based responsibility, particular approaches to school evaluation have not been centrally pushed. We have avoided and sought to discourage the notion that there is any particular 'right' or 'preferred' approach ... rather we have encouraged and facilitated schools trying a variety of approaches and are continuing with this policy."[12]

(Western Australia)

"In New South Wales, we find it useful within the total concept of evaluation, to think separately about a number of different categories. For example, we see considerable differences between evaluative exercises which are designed for accountability purposes and those whose primary or exclusive aim is program betterment. Again, we find that there is little in common between a sophisticated state-wide evaluation of a pervasive government initiative and the typical teacher-initiated evaluation of achievement at classroom level, or even a whole-school appraisal."[13]

(New South Wales)

"In summary it could be said that during the 1970's the following points were agreed upon by Tasmanian educationists concerning the issues of educational evaluation:

- it should be school-based;
- it should be a collegial discussion process;
- it should be a built-in aspect of curriculum development;
- it should involve students and members of the community."[14]

(Tasmania)

"In summary, this (policy) is that evaluation be school-based and teacher-initiated and operated, that reports to the School Board should be at the discretion of teaching staff, that no compulsion to report to the Schools Authority should exist, and that the Schools Office should support and resource evaluations in schools."[15]

(Australian Capital Territory)

> "The purpose of school evaluation is to enable the school to bring about improvement in its activities. The initiative for an evaluation of any aspect or aspects of a school's activities lies with the school ... The outcomes of any evaluations are owned within the school ... System-wide resources in support of school evaluation will be planned to enable all schools to become involved in ongoing evaluation programs."[16]
>
> (South Australia)

A common stand is the emphasis on self-evaluation for school improvement; generally viewed as a co-operative venture, supported at the system level by the provision of resources. The Schools Commission reinforces this approach, viewing school-level evaluation as a school-initiated change process designed to yield information for in-school use. Although this information may also be used at the system level for decision-making, primarily the system's role is to provide encouragement for the evaluation process by the provision of resources, dissemination of information and supplying of a climate in which schools are encouraged to act.[17]

There are differences however, in interpretations of the roles of the system and the school in school-level evaluation. Three state systems (Queensland, Northern Territory and Victoria) and some independent and Catholic schools favour detailed guidelines prepared by personnel at the system level for adaptation by individual schools to meet their needs and priorities.[18] These are used by the school staff who carry out the evaluation which is later reviewed by a panel of outsiders. The emphasis is on 'whole school' evaluation and its purpose is primarily for curriculum improvement. The use of outsiders does however provide a means of legitimising the operation for accountability purposes at the system level.

In South Australia and the Australian Capital Territory, schools are encouraged to undertake school-level evaluations although generally no overt pressure is applied at the system level to do this. Rather, both Education Departments provide resources on request. This approach appears to be working quite successfully; for example, in the Australian Capital Territory in 1979, over twenty (of ninety) schools were involved in voluntary school-level evaluations.[19]

Some state, Catholic and independent systems encourage informal system assistance in school-level evaluation activities. Often this involves the use of 'volunteer' schools who are involved in trialling different approaches to facilitate further development and teacher appreciation of the need for ongoing evaluation.[20] In this context, school-level evaluation is undertaken for curriculum improvement and can involve 'insiders' and outsiders'.[21]

Obviously these statements are at best generalisations about the type of evaluation initiatives supported by state and independent education systems, and within each system there will be exceptions. The statements are intended to highlight the different approaches to school-level evaluation currently being undertaken in Australia and to raise issues.

To date, school-level evaluation has centred on the notion of evaluation for curriculum improvement, been viewed as an essential part of school-based curriculum development and been deliberately kept apart from the notion of accountability. However this situation is now changing. With increasing demands for 'back to the basics', state-wide testing programs and teacher accountability, many teachers remain unconvinced of the value of time spent in evaluating curricula when external pressures for accountability are demanding a more public statement of educational practice.

A number of educators have however, linked school level evaluation to the notion of accountability by viewing the latter in terms of teacher responsibility to give an account of what is proposed in a program or process.[22] By a proper account:

> "is meant one that usefully communicates to a particular audience why the course is proposed, what studying it will involve, and what evidence of learning will be available to the learners and other interested persons."[23]

This approach appears to offer a number of advantages: it ensures that the planning of educational outcomes remains essentially a school-level activity, suited to the needs of particular districts and individual students; it provides teachers with a non-threatening method of describing their purposes; it provides the community with a ready and useful source of information and the opportunity to make inputs into the educational process, and it ensures that evaluation is undertaken in a systematic manner because it now has a clearly stated focus.

Obviously this idea needs to be fully explored if it is to be seen as a viable method of linking school-level evaluation and accountability. Strategies must be devised for the preparation and presentation of accounts, structures must be developed for the dissemination of information contained in accounts and for the creation of conditions of response to them, and support systems must be established to help teacher-evaluators.

THE ROLE OF TEACHERS AND THE SCHOOL IN THE EVALUATION PROCESS

The nature of school evaluation dictates the type of role available to teachers and the school in the evaluation process. Hogben classifies approaches to evaluation in the following terms:

> insiders for insiders
> insiders for outsiders
> outsiders for insiders
> outsiders for outsiders.[24]

However, if teacher-initiated school-level evaluation is viewed as a means of improving the curriculum, it follows that the first approach should be actively supported because many teachers currently perceive evaluation to be a threatening or time-consuming activity. It is only by emphasising the internal nature of the exercise that they will develop the confidence and the skills to show the public both what they do in schools and how it is evaluated.

At present, teachers undertake evaluations for a variety of reasons and it is important to be aware of motivations such as the following which prompt evaluation:

1. An interest in improving teaching and making a better job of meeting the needs of the pupils.

2. A desire to examine the effect of or problems introduced by new curricula or organisational changes.

3. A concern to justify or give a 'stamp of approval' to school practices in the face of criticism from parents and/or the public.

4. A response to teacher dissatisfaction with school procedures, conveyed through professional colleagues or associations.

5. A response to external pressures from other parts of the education system (often 'invisible') for a school to give an account of itself, for example, the final two years of secondary school.

6. A fulfilment of an obligation to report on a funded program.

7. A desire to settle conflict in the school, e.g. personalities, power, roles.

8. A response to an 'official' evaluation - to protect the interests of the staff and school.

9. A desire to draw attention to forward-looking policies in the school, often for 'band-waggoning' reasons.

10. An opportunity for individuals to:

    - increase personal status
    - 'build an empire'
    - gain a promotion
    - change the balance of power
    - gain higher qualifications, e.g. an evaluation provides data for a thesis.

Experience shows that it is important not to ignore these motivations and it has been suggested that a series of Organisational Development type activities might be usefully introduced in a school prior to evaluation.[26] These would serve as a means of developing school cohesion and help prepare staff for the issues that inevitably emerge during and evaluation. The potential for using Organisational Development in conjunction with school-level evaluation activities has been researched by Mulford.[27] He suggests that there is a need to focus on the implementation stage of evaluation and that effective implementation only occurs when teachers are working as a cohesive, co-operative unit. Organisational Development methods show potential for obtaining this favourable climate.

Data about teachers and schools which have carried out school-level evaluations are fairly limited, particularly with respect to follow-up activities. Certain trends can however, be discerned.

Evaluations occur at three distinct but inter-related levels - classroom, grade/department/subject and whole school. Examples of evaluations undertaken at all three levels can be found within all Australian education systems and many of these are described in Teachers as Evaluators Project bibliographies.[28]

From report recommendations and verbal comments made by teachers, there is evidence to indicate that the first evaluation undertaken by teachers should focus on one discrete area of the school's curriculum, for example, the language program, rather than something as wide ranging and abstract as the school's philosophy and objectives. This permits the program to be reviewed, initially at the classroom level, then if desirable, at the grade or department level, and finally across the whole school, thus allowing teachers to develop evaluation skills before tackling the more abstract areas of curriculum.[29]

Obviously it is not always possible to carry out an evaluation entirely by insiders for insiders. Often schools request the presence of an outsider to act as an objective evaluator or to take the role of facilitator or resource person, or a team is sent out to assist the school to conduct its evaluation. However, whichever approach is taken, the following factors should be taken into account if the material held in the Teachers as Evaluators Project collection is a guide.[30]

1. Don't undertake an evaluation study in a school unless there is a deep-seated conviction by a majority of the school staff involved that they want it done. In many ways, it is crucial that early initiatives for an evaluation study come from the whole school staff.

2. Facilitate the process of problem identification so that the one chosen is of the greatest concern to the greatest number of participants.

3. If the area is a fairly isolated one, (e.g. faculty problem, subject matter, grade level etc.) let the people concerned in that area have complete charge of the evaluation. It is their privilege and responsibility to invite outsiders as they see fit.

4. Don't undertake an evaluation study which doesn't incorporate clear and comprehensive procedures for relaying information back to school staff. Staff members must be kept informed and involved in the project. This can only be accomplished by frequent interactions using workshops, seminars, a data in progress notice board, or a staff access file.

5. If an outside group is involved, don't undertake an evaluation project unless one or more of the outside team can assign substantial amounts of time to it. Outside team members working on a part-time basis can be easily diverted to other pressing demands and as a result, the momentum of the evaluation quickly diminishes.

These are only tentative findings about the conditions most conducive to school-level evaluation. The possible roles of teachers and the school in the process require further clarification.

THE AVAILABILITY OF RESOURCES TO SUPPORT TEACHERS/SCHOOL COMMUNITIES UNDERTAKING EVALUATIONS

Although teachers and schools are playing a wider role in school-level evaluation, on occasions the term 'evaluation' elicits a cynical response. This is often attributable to underlying uncertainty and feelings of inadequacy relating to curriculum evaluation. Thus, when resources are allocated for school-level evaluation, it is important that they are of a kind which both complements and builds on the teacher's own experience.

The Teachers as Evaluators Project collection houses a wide variety of materials relating to evaluation theory and practice, but it is becoming increasingly evident that some of these are of limited value to some teachers undertaking school-level evaluations.

Initially, papers by such noted figures as Stake, Scriven, MacDonald, Kemmis, Parlett & Hamilton, and Tyler tend to be actively avoided by teachers requiring information. On the rare occasions they are perused, there is a noticeable and negative response. This is not to deny these papers a place in school-level evaluation. Postgraduate students (who are generally teachers) constantly use them, as do teachers who have had extensive evaluation practice and feel the need for some underlying theory. Their greatest value appears to lie however, in the background theory they provide for educators planning evaluation workshops and pre-service and post-graduate evaluation courses.

Most teachers request articles that are brief, readable, informative and 'jargon-free'.[31] In particular, they seek guidelines which meet these requirements and which provide scope for further development by teachers to suit their particular needs.

Unfortunately, such guidelines are in short supply and there is a clear need to develop more. It is also important to monitor the effects of the evaluation guides which have already been distributed, both informally, for example, Queensland Co-operative Guidelines[32] were sent to every school in the state, and more formally, for example, the Teachers as Evaluators Project Guides are distributed at evaluation workshops.[33]

It is becoming increasingly evident that important variables include:

1. The role of the consultant/facilitator in presenting a guideline - if a school works through the process alone, does the guide become little more than a checklist, and if so, what are the benefits of the process?

2. The nature of the guide - do most schools prefer clearly specified steps in a guide, or something which gives them scope for adaptation to their own situation?

3. The availability of extra resources, for example, pupil-free days, teacher-time release, use of a specialist consultant,[34] use of teachers from other schools.

Apart from some form of evaluation guide, teachers are keen to read of descriptions of evaluations undertaken by other teachers. Again, good descriptions are in short supply and the ones that are available tend to be in similar areas. In this regard, the collection has no descriptions of evaluations undertaken in the fields of music or physical education. Many 'whole school evaluations' or 'whole school reviews' tend to concentrate on issues such as school-community relations, pastoral care systems, communication within the school and the elective programs, and ignore individual subject areas. Furthermore, most descriptions are written in an extremely positive way and while these are of value, the best descriptions are those that also share their problems with the reader. Few teachers are interested in reading about another school's statistical results but they are interested in hearing about the potentials, pitfalls and consequences of the school-level evaluation process.

A variety of media resources have been produced recently. As these are limited in number, there is a need for system sharing and monitoring to determine their suitability and impact. The Project is presently developing trial tape/slide sequences to illustrate evaluation procedures and raise issues, and a twenty minute videotape has been produced for use in training workshops.[35] Several videotapes have also been made which portray school-level evaluations or form the basis of an evaluation report.[36]

Perhaps the most important resource, and currently the most limited, is the human resource. Until recently there was a very small band of evaluation specialists, and even now the numbers of people willing and able to help teachers carry out school-level evaluations are far below that required by teachers.

Most states and systems offer assistance in the form of regional or central curriculum officers. Obviously there are just not enough of these people for the task. While it is tempting to create more positions for evaluation consultants, there is a danger that they may not meet the needs of teachers.

Teachers and principals claim they need advisers who have had practical experience in school-level evaluation, who are in touch with resources (both material and human) and who can assist a school.[37] In this sense, the personal and professional credibility of and trust for an adviser is certainly an issue. The need for advisers who can train teachers to conduct their own evaluations is a high priority in many of the state and territory education departments.

THE PARTICULAR NEEDS OF TEACHER-EVALUATORS

Despite the availability of increased resources and guidelines, for many teachers, the term 'school-level curriculum evaluation' is a confusing one. Thus, there is a need for personnel in education systems to state clearly the purposes of school-level evaluation and their expectations concerning the roles of teachers in the process. Structures are also needed to permit teachers and curriculum personnel to meet and discuss the full implications and benefits and limitations of alternative procedures available to teachers.

Granted that school-level evaluation is occurring, teachers still require inservice workshops, guidelines, examples and time release to gain the necessary skills so that evaluation becomes an organic component in school-based curriculum development process, rather than something that is an all-consuming or one-off activity.

The types of information teachers particularly require are outlines of the steps involved in the evaluation process, suggestions for 'getting started', including a climate conducive to school-level evaluation and descriptions of methods of collecting information.

Most importantly however, teachers require encouragement to develop further a belief in their own capabilities. Until recently an air of mysticism surrounded the term 'evaluation', manifested by the use of jargon and the existence of an elite group of experts.[38] This notion is disappearing but until all teachers realise their potential as curriculum evaluators, the use of school-level evaluation as a means of improving teaching and learning will be limited.

CONCLUSION

Despite the complexity of developments in school-level curriculum

evaluation in Australia today, the information presented in this paper reveals some useful findings about current evaluation practice and the needs of teachers.

It is apparent that although state evaluation policy statements are similar, there are marked differences in the implementation of this policy, both at the system and school levels.

It is apparent that although state evaluation policy statements are similar, there are marked differences in the implementation of this policy, both at the system and school levels. Thus, there is a clear need to examine further the nature of school-level curriculum evaluation, its relationship with school-based curriculum development and accountability, and the possible roles of teachers in the process. This will primarily be the task of educators, working in collaboration with the wider community, so that expectations concerning the role of the school may be clarified.

A brief review of Teachers as Evaluators Project holdings reveals that there is no single evaluation approach or model that is used extensively throughout Australia. Nor is there a predisposition towards the ideas of a particular theorist or specialist. Teachers clearly prefer to take a pragmatic approach to evaluation, and want practical guidelines which can be adapted to meet their needs. It is important however that the guidelines produced have a strong theoretical base, and for this reason it may be some time before teachers develop the confidence to produce their own.

Examples of school-initiated evaluations held in the collection exemplify the wide range of interests and needs of teachers and schools in the evaluation area. However, tentative research findings indicate that at present there is only a limited number of guidelines and materials available for use by teachers. As these are difficult to obtain and expensive to develop, there is a clear need to share existing resources. It is also important to monitor the impact of these resources, both to provide schools and systems with up to date information about the benefits and limitations of particular approaches, and to facilitate the dissemination of information.

It is becoming increasingly evident that those assisting teachers must use the teachers' skills and experience as the base from which to work. Furthermore, as teachers are keen to read descriptions of curriculum evaluations undertaken by other teachers, they should be encouraged to give 'accounts' of their own evaluation activities, and to make these available for others to read.

Thus, future developments in the area of school-level curriculum evaluation will rest in the hands of teachers and system personnel. A major part of the task will involve the sharing of information and resources, and in particular people already engaged in evaluation must use their skills to further develop approaches that are appropriate both for themselves and for others working in the area.

NOTES

1. G.W. Beeson and R.F. Gunstone "School-based curriculum decisions: some issues and suggestions", *Unicorn* Vol. 4, No. 2, July 1978, p.176.

2. 'School-based curriculum development' is used as an 'umbrella' term to include a wide range of processes. These may be considered as points on a continuum which extends from a formal course of study handed down by a central authority, to an informal program devised by a particular school to meet the needs of its students.

3. For a discussion of factors limiting school-based curriculum development see:

   E. Davis "School-based curriculum development, core curriculum, evaluation and accountability", *VISE News Bulletin* No. 14, Oct/Nov 1979, p.3.

   M. Schiller "School-based curriculum development pipe-dream or reality?" *Pivot*, Special supplement, 1976, pp.27-28.

4. These thoughts are expressed in:

   I. Gordon "The Scope of Curriculum Evaluation", *Curriculum Studies Discussion Paper* No. 2, May, 1974.

   T. Ryan and others "When and how can evaluation be best used in S.B.C.D.?" From Participants' Report of 1978 *Standing Conference in Curriculum Development: Scope & Limitations School-based Curriculum Development: Leadership Roles & Responsibilities*, Newport, N.S.W. May, 1978.

5. P.W. Hughes, N.A. Russell, D. McConachy "Accounting for Our Schools: Problems & Possibilities". A paper prepared for the *Australian Administrator* (to be published, date unknown).

6. P.W. Hughes, N.A. Russell and D. McConachy "Curriculum Evaluation in Australia: A New Challenge for Teachers", *Teachers as Evaluators Project Discussion Paper No.1*, Canberra College of Advanced Education, June 1979, p.16.

7. P. Deschamp and B. McGaw "Responsibility for Curriculum Evaluation in Centralized Systems" *Australian Journal of Education* Vol.23, No.3, October 1979.

8. These questions have been raised consistently by teachers and principals attending evaluation workshops.

9. C. Gilmour, Director-General of Education in "Forward", *Co-operative School Evaluation: A Guide for Queensland Secondary Schools*, Education Department of Queensland, 1977.

10. *A Guide for Development School Appraisal in Northern Territory Schools* (Draft Version) School Appraisal Committee, Education Department of the Northern Territory, March 1978, p.1.

11. *School Review Resource Book*, Secondary Division, Education Department of Victoria, 1980, p.4.

12. Excerpt from a letter written by Mr. D. Mossenson, Director-General of Education, Western Australia, to Mr. P.W. Hughes, Director, Teachers as Evaluators Project, November 1979.

13. Excerpt from a letter written by Mr D. Swan, Director-General of Education, New South Wales, to Mr P.W. Hughes, Director, Teachers as Evaluators Project, December 1979.

14. Report of Management Committee, *School-based Curriculum Project 1978-1979*, Education Department of Tasmania, June 1979, p.5.

15. W. Donovan and J. Grand "Educational Accountability - School Evaluation in the A.C.T." in W. Mulford and others (eds) *A.C.T. Papers on Education 1978-79*, Canberra College of Advanced Education, 1979, p.95.

16. "School Controlled Evaluation" *Schools Discussion Paper No.3*, Education Department of South Australia, July 1978, p.7.

17. Schools Commission "Guidelines for School Level Evaluation Projects 198[illegible]", in Circular 5/80 March 1980.

18. *Co-operative School Evaluation: A Guide for Queensland Primary Schools and Co-operative School Evaluation: A Guide for Queensland Secondary Schools*, Education Department of Queensland, 1977.

    A Guide for Developmental School Appraisal in Northern Territory Schools (Draft Version), School Appraisal, Education Department of the Northern Territory, 1978.

    School Review Resource Book, Secondary Division, Education Department of Victoria, 1980.

    N. Creese and P.A.V. Roff (eds.) *Manual for School Evaluation*, Headmasters' Conference of the Independent Schools Association, 1976.

19. Donovan and Grant, *op. cit.* p.95.

20. For example:

    1. In Western Australia, the Director-General initiated three evaluation projects using external evaluators from tertiary institutions. (For further information, see P. Deschamp "What Have We Learned?: A Report of a Seminar on External School Evaluation", Draft Paper, Education Department of Western Australia, June 1979.)

2. In Tasmania the Schools Commission and the Education Department of Tasmania jointly funded a project which involved eight schools in school-level evaluation activities. (For further information see Report by the Management Committee, *op. cit.*)

3. In Queensland a number of primary and secondary schools from the Catholic system have been invited to partake in school-level evaluation activities. Br. R. Goodwin and Sr. K. Caldwell are the facilitators for the project which commenced this year and is funded by the Schools Commission.

21. D. Hogben "Curriculum Evaluation For Whom, By Whom?" Paper presented to the Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Canberra, 1977.

22. P. Fensham *Giving an Account*, Curriculum Development Centre, Canberra, 1980 (in press).

J. Elliot "Classroom Accountability and the self-monitoring teacher" in W. Harlen (ed.) *Evaluation and the Teacher's Role* Schools Council, N.F.E.R., U.K. 1978.

23. P. Fensham, *op. cit.* p.2.

24. D. Hogben, *op. cit.*

25. These motivations were suggested by teachers and evaluation consultants attending a Summer School conducted by Dr Wynne Harlen for the Teachers as Evaluators Project, January 1979.

26. P. Moore "An Evaluation Plan for a Catholic Secondary School" Unpublished Paper, Canberra College of Advanced Education, 1980.

27. W. Mulford "Pre-requisites for Effective Educational Evaluation and their Facilitation". Paper presented at 6th Annual Conference of the Australian Council for Educational Administration, Perth, August 1979.

28. Teachers as Evaluators Project Bibliography - Part I (1978), Part II (1979), Part III (in press), Curriculum Development Centre, Canberra.

29. E. Lovegrove *The Morphett Vale High School Evaluation Program*, Education Department of South Australia, 1979.

For an example of this approach see *Duffy Primary School Reading Evaluation*, Duffy Primary School, A.C.T. 1977.

30. These factors are identified by:

C. Marsh "Parkview High School-Evaluation Case Study" Unpublished paper, Murdoch University, W.A., 1978, pp4-5.

Gininderra High School, *Evaluation as an integral part of school-based curriculum development - an A.C.T. High School example*, A.C.T. 1977.

Report by the Management Committee, *op. cit.*, p.26.

31. *Ibid.* pp.11-12.

32. Queensland Guidelines *op.cit.*

33. Teachers as Evaluators Project "A Guide to Evaluation" and "Questions to Ask When Planning and Evaluation", Curriculum Development Centre, 1980.

34. *Report of Teachers as Evaluators Project Liaison Officers' Meeting*, Canberra College of Advanced Education, February 1980.

35. Tape/slide sequences include:

"Evaluation of Audio-Typing and Model Office"

"Evaluation in Junior Science and Biology"

"Evaluation of an Environmental Science Field Trip"

The videotape is a 20 minute 3/4" video cassette entitled "School-Level Evaluation".

36. Taylor Primary School, "Portrayal of S.M.P. Maths Program". This is a 17 minute 3/4" video cassette.

37. *Schools Commission Report for 1980*, A.C.P.S., July 1979, p.2.

38. W. Mulford "School Evaluation", *A.C.T. Teachers' Federation Bulletin No.4*, March 1977, p.4.